



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE MINUTES

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2006

**LOCATION: CAUCUS ROOMS
CARMEL CITY HALL
ONE CIVIC SQUARE
CARMEL, IN 46032**

**TIME: 6:00 P.M.
DOORS OPEN AT 5:30 P.M.**

Those Present:

Representing the Committee:

Dan Dutcher
Wayne Haney
Kevin Heber
Rick Ripma
Carol Schleif

Representing the Department:

Angie Conn
Christine Barton-Holmes

Of Counsel:

John Molitor

Rick Ripma called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00p.m.

The Subdivision Committee will meet to consider the following items:

- Docket No. 06030005 PP: Village on the Monon**
Docket No. 06030028 SW: SCO Chapter 7.05.07, Woodlands
The applicant seeks to plat 19 lots on 6.29 acres.
The site is located at 1320 Rohrer Road and is zoned R1 Residential
Filed by Kevin Roberts of DeBoy Land Development Services for The Anderson Corporation.

Present for the Petitioner: Kevin Roberts with DeBoy Land Development Services, Jim Anderson with the Anderson Corporation, and Darlene Lorenz with the Anderson Corporation.

Petitioner's Presentation: Kevin Roberts said that the project consisted of 19 parcels located adjacent to Rhorer Meadows. He said that there is an entry to Rhorer Road with the appropriate acceleration and deceleration lanes. He said that the Committee had asked for some aerial photos of the project. He said that engineering is satisfied with the plan. He said that they had received a few nominal comments that day from Engineering. He said that Engineering didn't like the shape of the median along Rhorer Road. He said that they were going to fix that. He said that he thinks that Planning is satisfied with the project. He said that after discussion with Scott Brewer regarding the project, he believes that Scott Brewer is satisfied that the petitioners are going in the right direction with the project.

Rick Ripma called for General Public Comments – Favorable.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed subdivision's access to the Monon Trail.

Rick Ripma called for Organized Remonstrance – Unfavorable.

Seeing none, **Rick Ripma** called for General Public Comments – Unfavorable.

Department Report: Angie Conn said that on the Department Report there were five items that should be addressed. She said that the first item was that the petitioner was to provide the Staff with a copy of the Shade tree mitigation plan. She said that the environmental planner, Scott Brewer, is working with the petitioner on those plans. She said that in the covenants and restrictions for the proposed subdivision, Staff would like the petitioner to clearly specify that the access at Rhorer Road may be limited to right in and right out in the future. She said that way future homeowners would know that may occur. She said that the third item is that a revised copy of the primary plat should be submitted to the City Engineer's office. She said that she has the comment that any revised commitments in regards to the Draft Residential Architectural Guidelines should be submitted. She said that she gave the petitioners a copy of the guidelines. She said that the Department requests that the commitments be recorded, including all Engineering commitments. She said that the Department does recommend that the Committee forward the request to the Full Plan Commission with a positive recommendation.

Carol Schleif asked if the petitioner had agreed to the Draft Residential Architectural Guidelines.

Darlene Lorenz said that they had agreed to everything except for two things that they were not able to agree to. She said that they were not able to fully meet the width of the garage. She said that because the garage is front loading, it would need to take up more than thirty percent of the front elevation.

Carol Schleif said that she wanted to know how many stories the buildings were going to be and how big the footprint was going to be.

Jim Anderson said that the homes were going to be a range of 1750 square feet to 2350 square feet. He said that they were going to be all main floor masters. He said that the footprint would be about

June 6, 2006
Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes
1750 square feet.

Carol Schleif said that their documents say that the footprints would be a minimum of 1500 square feet.

Jim Anderson said that he didn't think that it would be that small and that they could change the documents to say that the minimum footprints would be 1700 square feet.

Discussion ensued regarding the R-1 requirements under the ROSO ordinance.

Angie Conn clarified that when a subdivision meets the ROSO requirements, then they are exempt from certain height and width requirements, such as lot standards, and lot area. She said that it just says that the minimum distance between dwellings shall be six feet. She said that is the incentive for the developer to give open space.

Kevin Roberts said that the petitioners are still satisfying the 2.9 units per acre.

Rick Ripma clarified that since the filing was not going to be a PUD, then the petitioners were not always required to submit the same things. He also clarified that the project would not be coming back before them. He said that it seems that there is an issues there with the woodlands.

Carol Schleif said that there were so many houses on the property that the petitioner's had to cut down trees.

Jim Anderson said that their tree inventory showed 109 trees and that of those 109 they were going to be able to save 52 and they were going to attempt to save an additional 22 trees. He did say that they were pretty certain that they were going to lose 35 trees. He noted that the landscape plan proposed to replant 49 trees plus one shade tree on each lot hat one would be removed. He said that what the petitioners have proposed to Scott Brewer is that the petitioners would accept responsibility to replace trees at a 1:1 ratio for the first three years after development.

Carol Schleif said that #90, a 20 ft. Norway Spruce, is shown in the right of way. She said that tree could be moved with a ninety-inch spade. She said that there are a couple of sugar maples that are due to be cut. She said that number 65, a Blue Ash, should really be saved. She said that number 108 is a huge maple that should be saved. She said that the Norway should be moved. She said that she had done that herself.

Rick Ripma asked what size trees they would be replacing the large trees they were taking down with.

Jim Anderson said that they would be 2 and a half caliper.

Carol Schleif asked the petitioner if they could do larger trees. She said that the petitioners would be taking out a lot of the canopy and the greenery on the site.

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

Kevin Roberts said that Scott Brewer has always told him that he prefers two and a half caliper trees as opposed to larger caliper because the survivability is not a good.

She said that it would be well worth the money to have it moved because the tree seems incredible.

Dan Dutcher said that he thinks that trees are an important area of focus. He said that it was great to see this detailed of a tree inventory. He said that he thinks that it lacks a sign off from Scott Brewer. He said that he would like to see Scott Brewer respond to the tree inventory in detail. He said that he thought that there might be some individual trees on the site that Scott Brewer might recommend be moved. He said that the approach that the petitioner's have taken on the trees is a great model and significant. He said that he was more comfortable regarding the woodlands waiver since the homework has been done. He said that he thinks the missing piece is getting Scott Brewer's sign off.

Discussion ensued about the Draft residential guidelines and how the petitioners are not going to be able to meet two of those guidelines.

Rick Ripma said that the petitioners had not discussed what percentage of the front elevation would include garage.

Darlene Lorenz said that the garages would be twenty feet wide and then the rest of the front elevation is between 25 and 30 feet.

Rick Ripma clarified that the rest of the home would be between 45 and 50 feet wide.

Discussion ensued regarding the flexibility and creativity of design that ROSO offers in exchange for the salvation of open space and tree preservation and the intent of the ROSO ordinance as it related to development.

Carol Schleif said that she felt that the lots were too small for what the petitioner's wanted to do. She said that she would like to see the plans for these homes and what they are intended to look like. She said that when she sees front loading garages, she immediately thinks that the lots are too small or too narrow.

Kevin Heber said that one thing that he would be interested to see other wildlife in the site noted in the study. He said that there was another development in Carmel that actually said that they would commit to, as the area is being cleared, any wildlife that would jump out, would be trapped and moved to be released in another environment. He said that he thought that was a pretty cool idea.

Wayne Haney clarified that the actual minimum lot width of the property would be 120 feet if the Open Space ordinance did not apply to the property. He clarified that the exemption provided by the open space ordinance allowed the petitioners to bring in minimum lot width of around fifty feet. He said that was too much of a jump and that compromise provided by the open space ordinance should be cut out, because the lots were too narrow.

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

Carol Schleif said that she thinks that the garage and entryway comments would be resolved if the lots were wider. She said that it would cost some lots.

Rick Ripma asked what the minimum side yard was.

Jim Anderson commented that the requirement was six feet on either side.

Discussion ensued regarding the side yard requirements related to the Open Space ordinance.

Jim Anderson commented that under the straight R-1 zoning ordinance standards they wouldn't be able to design to save trees and woodlands. He said that the exchange is trees in your backyard in exchange for the backyard. He said that with marketing empty nesters a large backyard really doesn't matter. He said that if they were to conform to the R-1 and have to go to 100 ft. lots, then it would really deplete the number of trees that will be left on the site. He said that was why they came in under the Open Space ordinance. He said that they thought that was the intent of the ordinance.

Carol Schleif said that the petitioners, because they were going over the fifteen percent, were asking the Plan Commission for accommodations for that. She said that the trade off is housing that the Plan Commission thinks is maybe too small and not what they want. She said that she thinks that the lots are too small.

Jim Anderson said that they were trying to attract people who were older and didn't want to care for huge wooded lots again. He said that the part of the Homeowner's Association dues would be a fee for maintenance of the lots.

Carol Schleif said that could be done on any sized lots. She said that it doesn't mean they have to be small like what is proposed. She said that six feet between buildings is poor. She said that she has a problem with losing that many trees for buildings this close together.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the Committee or the petitioner wanted a vote.

Dan Dutcher said that his sense is that if the petitioners have gone as far as they can go on the density issue, then they should vote.

Jim Anderson said that they would like to ask for a continuance.

Rick Ripma said that the petition would be continued to the June 29, 2006 meeting.

...END...

2. Docket No. 06010001 Z: Monon Townes PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 6.81 acres from R1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating 65 townhomes.

The site is located at 1001 Rohrer Road.

Filed by Ann M. Walker for Pulte Homes of Indiana, LLC.

3. Docket No. 06010005 Z: Shelborne Property PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 20 acres from S1/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of developing single-family residences.

The site is located on the west side of Shelborne Road, north of 121st Street.

Filed by Charles Frankenger of Nelson and Frankenger for Indiana Land Development Co.

4. Docket No. 06010009 Z: Crook PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 20 acres from S1/Residential to PUD for the purpose of platting 40 single family homes on 20 acres.

The site is located at 2238 W. 136th Street and is zoned S1/Residential.

Filed by Charlie Frankenger of Nelson and Frankenger for Indiana Land Development.

5. Docket No. 06020006 PUD: Aramore PUD

The applicant seeks a rezone to create 150 townhomes & 72 courthomes on 27.35 ac.

The site is located near the SE corner of Westfield Blvd and 99th St. and is zoned S2.

Filed by Nick Churchill of Pittman Partners Inc.

Present for the Petitioner: Steve Pittman with Pittman Partners, Neal Smith with Pittman Partners, and Nick Churchill with Pittman Partners.

Petitioner's Presentation: Steve Pittman said that they had been working on the project for about 15 months as the City had been putting together the neighborhood plan. He said that the area has been undergoing redevelopment for quite some time. He said that the City of Carmel in their unapproved neighborhood plan and the unapproved Carmel Comprehensive Plan kind of pegged the area as mixed use residential. He said that they even called for at one point a redevelopment of the houses fronting Westfield Blvd. At 96th Street. He said that about 6-8 homes are rentals. He said that they had proposed something unique because the proposed development would not consist of all townhomes but would also have a high-end empty-nester single-family product that he called a courthome in the back. He said that the courthomes section consisted of two units on top of two units. He said that they would also have elevators in the lower level for people to go up. He said that they anticipated that those units would be priced in the high two hundred thousand s to the high three hundred thousands. He said that the townhomes would be priced at just under two hundred thousand up to three hundred thousand. He said that one of the discussions that has occurred in Carmel is that there are a lot of townhomes that have been proposed recently in Carmel and how deep is that market. He said that most of the townhome development occurring is occurring a little bit farther North. He said that one of the comments that they agreed with from a prior meeting was that too much of one thing is probably not good, even if that one thing is good. He said that one thing that hasn't been seen in this market in Carmel is 24-inch overhangs for the soffits. He said that they have varied the elevations. He discussed the specific architectural details of the different elevations. He noted that Connectivity was important to them because of the amenities in the area. He said that they would be building a retaining wall around the detention areas because of the massive drainage problem in the site and the infrastructure improvements that have to happen in the

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

site. He said that they wanted to put in some seating in the common areas. He said that 47% of the site is going to be green area.

Carol Schleif clarified that the green area calculation included the wet areas as well.

Steve Pittman said that in the courthome areas, the common area in that area is going to be approximately 57%. He said that the separation between houses is going to be 20 feet, but closer to 28 feet in most places. He said that the rear building setback was going to be anywhere from 25 feet to 35 feet. He said that in the townhome area, the closest buildings would be 20 feet. He said that he could make a commitment for not less than fifteen feet. He said that there is no median cut, so they have committed to building and funding that median cut. He said that they had committed to installing the ten-foot asphalt trail. He said that they would go down 98th street and build a ten-foot asphalt trail. He said that he didn't believe that it was asked for, but that they felt that it was important for connectivity. He said that they also agreed to dedicate all of the appropriate right of way necessary on 99th street and Westfield Blvd. He said that they have agreed that they will fund 100% of the offsite storm drainage all of the way to I-465. He said that would improve a lot of people's properties in the area. He said that Engineering agreed today that they were comfortable with their commitments and that they were comfortable with the petitioner's moving forward in the process with the understanding that the petitioner understands that when they get to the construction plan phase, there will still be issues to be hashed out. He commented that they had just purchased a ninety-inch spade and a fifty-five inch spade.

Rick Ripma called for General Public Comments – Favorable.

John Tintera, who resides at 2828 N. Cambridge Avenue in Chicago, IL, but who owns the property at 2700 E. 96th Street. He said that he lives and works in Chicago, but that he grew up in Indianapolis and has been attending public meetings in Carmel since 2003. He said that from the things that petitioner has presented and from all of the initiatives that the City of Carmel has had, he said that he believes that the project is consistent with the directive and the goals. He said that it is just a continuation of what Carmel is trying to achieve and he said that because of this, he is just generally in favor of this project.

Rick Ripma called for any other general public comments favorable.

Glen Baines, who resides at 9629 Lincoln Blvd., asked if the letter from the Engineering Department addressed the Maple Drive going through or not going through.

Steve Pittman responded that it did not address that. He said that the Engineering Department had told him that they would like the roads to connect. He said that he had told Engineering that they did not want it to go through.

Rick Ripma called for organized remonstrance unfavorable. Seeing none, he called for General Public Comments – unfavorable.

Dennis Mauer, who resides at 9642 Maple Drive, said that generally speaking they are not opposed

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

to the development, but that they are concerned about the three –story construction of the townhomes. He said that everything around this development is an S-1 or an S-2 zoning. He said that there is concern about the density even though it has been reduced. He said that the Retreat is already a super dense development nearby. He said that they are questioning that with the density of the proposal, if it is really necessary to go the three stories up. He said that the amount of concrete to be put in would result in more effort for the petitioner.

Dorothy Greene, who resides at 9845 Woodbriar Lane, said that her main concern is with drainage because it is bad now. She said that the drainage along Maple Drive might be helped, but she wanted to know about Woodbriar Lane. She said that she would have these two-story houses would be staring at her one-story ranch. She noted that her entire street was comprised of one-story ranches, with the exception of one split-level. She asked the petitioner what about the drainage?

David Wood, who owns the property at 9641 Lincoln Blvd., said that he doesn't understand why the townhome development would have to open in the back out to Maple Drive. He asked why they needed to create more of a traffic problem. He said that he just didn't understand why they needed to open it up to Maple. He said that it would just make more traffic and more congestion. He said that they could put the two entrances out to Westfield. He said that it was unfavorable to him to have an entrance open to Maple.

Rick Ripma called for additional General Public comments – unfavorable. Seeing none, he asked for the petitioner's rebuttal.

Steve Pittman said that he understood the concern regarding the connection to Maple Drive. He said that they don't feel that they have to connect. He said that from a safety standpoint, he felt that Mr. Wood's comments were that there were already two points of ingress and egress. He said that they could connect it and put bollards up or something, but that ultimately the decision would be deferred to the City of Carmel. He said that as far as the drainage issues that Dorothy Greene brought up, the drainage in the entire area would be vastly improved. He said that they would not be coming into her neighborhood and picking up water and bringing it over to the site. He said that whatever water that is there that drains to the site, it would be efficiently picked up and moved off the site and would drain down to I-465.

Discussion ensued regarding a 1983 drainage plan for the surrounding neighborhoods that was never built.

Steve Pittman said that if they were to do entirely courthomes in the development, then they would be getting away from what they have been asked to do, which was to incorporate differing product types. He said that Carmel would like to see him vary the design even more. He said that they don't think that the three stories are an issue. He said that they own most of the property that fronts the other lots. He said that the City had talked about the possibility of adding a commercial and retail node as part of the development. He said that he had gotten negative response on that idea. But, that he would incorporate a commercial/retail node if the Committee found that acceptable.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that the Department Report had been modified slightly.

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

She said that the Urban forester is okay with the landscape plan. She said that the Engineering Department is okay with everything as long as the outstanding issues will be worked out when the petitioners come back with the Construction Plans. She said that the Department does recommend that the Committee vote on this project tonight and move it forward to the full Plan Commission.

Wayne Haney asked if they were demanding the entrance off of Westfield Boulevard be five hundred feet.

Rick Ripma said that it looks like the petitioners have put a little more land or used a little more buffering between some of the areas.

Steve Pittman said that they tried to. He said that they looked at all of the areas and tried to incorporate more landscaping and buffering where they could.

Rick Ripma asked if the petitioner knew how much was where 98th street should be.

Steve Pittman said that there was a 20-foot Right of Way on 98th Street. He said that they were going to grant an additional 25-foot Right of Way and then on his side of the Right of Way will be a 10-foot asphalt trail.

Discussion ensued regarding future road improvements around the perimeter of the site.

Rick Ripma said that he did not like the commercial idea at all. He said that he thought that was a big mistake. He said that he liked the designs of the products and the multiple building elevations.

Carol Schleif asked how much usable green space there was incorporated.

Steve Pittman said that he could answer how much of the site was encumbered by lakes. He said that would be a big visual amenity.

Carol Schleif said that she sees several units that have no view except for pavement. She said that she only sees two small areas where one could even sit. She said that there is still a lot of roof and a lot of concrete on the site. She said that she likes the two- story unit. She said that staff keeps asking for mixing of building types, but she said that, if you look at the literature they don't even start to do that until the site is at least eighty acres and the site is only 27.5 acres. She said that the townhomes just don't fit in the area. She said that she thinks that townhome elevations are nice, but that she doesn't think they go well with the surroundings. She said that if she sees that much water on the site, then, from a civil engineering standpoint, what she thinks is that drainage is an issue. She said that the site is really on the edge with the water and drainage. She said that if it isn't manageable yet, then are the petitioners trying to retain on site so they aren't flooding the neighbors downstream. She said that this site reeks of being a difficult site to drain and then the petitioners are covering it with asphalt. She said that it would be much safer for everybody if the petitioners went with more green and the courthomes all over. She said that the two building types on 27 acres, the precedent just isn't there. She said that she doesn't think that mixed building types apply here because the site is so small and she thinks that townhomes would be out of line. She said that

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

twenty-foot building separations for two buildings that are 37 feet high is intimidating. She said that the green space is virtually lost. She said that there has to be more usable green space here. She suggested that the petitioners consider putting the eave lines at the second story and then adding dormers or something along those lines to help the rooflines modulate with the surroundings.

Dan Dutcher said that he would like to hear from the Department on their views of the three-story townhomes. He gets the feeling that the Department might view this as a first step toward what will be a consistent and gradual evolution of the planned use for this area.

Christine Barton-Holmes said that they were looking at townhouses and two and three story structures as being more of a transition between what exists and the way that the area is beginning to develop. She said that staff wants to see a mix of housing types within developments and within entire neighborhoods. She said that staff is starting to see this greater height and greater density as Carmel starts running out of larger parcels. She said that Staff would prefer to see more usable green space and more permeable surface than the commercial area. She said that adding a commercial node, whether it is a coffee shop or a live work unit, is a preference based upon the high concentration of people.

Kevin Heber said that he is in agreement with most of the comments regarding more green space or a modest commercial node. He said that there is an obvious lack of places to hang around. He said that he is trying to believe that there will be a younger element there in the future and he said that he believes younger people appreciate places to hang out. He said that he would like to see a rendering from Westfield Blvd.

Discussion ensued regarding townhome products in Carmel, the real estate market in Carmel, and Carmel's desire to have mixed-use developments.

Dan Dutcher said that he sees the Plan Commission's responsibility differently. He said that he thinks that it is the responsibility of the Plan Commission to ensure that the developments are quality developments that are consistent with design standards that they think are appropriate. He said that they should be consistent with the long-range plan that the City has. He said that in this case he is comfortable with the quality and he is comfortable that this is consistent with the plan that the City has established for this area. He said that it is not the job of the Plan Commission to try to predict the real estate market.

Carol Schleif said that the current comprehensive plan didn't call for multi-family housing in this area. She said that she didn't see the need to do this project. She said that she felt that it was out of character with the area and with what the Comprehensive Plan called for.

Steve Pittman said that the comprehensive plan was to be a guide and that many parcels had been rezoned that didn't follow the comprehensive plan.

Carol Schleif said that was allowed for a hardship or good design. She said that the design wasn't up there in her opinion. She said that the only hardship that she could think of was that the site had too many drainage issues to have this much rooftop.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to send Docket number **06020006 PUD: Aramore PUD** back to the full Plan Commission with a **favorable recommendation**.

Wayne Haney seconded the motion.

Motion was **approved 4 in favor and 1 opposed (Schleif)**.

...END...

6. Docket No. 06020017 CPA: 96th & Westfield Neighborhood Plan. – CONT. TO JUNE 29

The applicant seeks to amend the Carmel/Clay Comprehensive Plan in order to incorporate the 96th & Westfield Neighborhood Plan.

Filed by the Carmel Department of Community Services.

7. Docket No. 06040017 PUD: Townhomes at Central Park

The applicant seeks to create 110 townhomes on 8.8 acres.

The site is located at 11400 Westfield Blvd. and is zoned R1 Residential

Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale for Mann Properties.

Present for the Petitioner: Mary Solada with Bingham McHale representing Mann Properties, and Greg Ewing, Brian Sullivan, Tim Seitz, and Tim Stephens from Mann Properties.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Mary Solada** said that the petitioners were pleased and proud to present a new site plan and new elevations. She said that they had reduced the density from 110 units to 101 units. She said that they had increased the setbacks from Westfield Blvd. She said that the units were not as close together and that the parking in front of the units in terms of being on the property in question. She said that they have increased the building separation. She said that they had increased the amount of guest parking. She said that the petitioner's have presented a more detailed landscaping plan. She said that they have fencing exhibits and that they have more detail about storm water management. She said that they have a new elevation also. She said that she thinks that the elevation is unique to Carmel and probably unique to Indianapolis. She said that the other thing that they need to emphasize is the sense of entry. She said that because of the increased separation and the decrease in 10% of the units, they were able to include a much better sense of arrival by integrating a boulevard effect and green space. She said that what is so unique about the project is that it is a unique piece of property in a unique setting in Carmel. She said that this is the only residential property at this point and time that is new development that would front on Central Park. She said that she emphasizes that because she feels that there is going to be great market demand and that she thinks that the property values in the area will remain strong. She said that they are planning to have front yards facing the park not the rear yards. She said that the petitioner's were there to listen and she said that they did not expect a vote. She said that there is a perception that the site is heavily wooded. She said that there are a number of trees along Westfield blvd. frontage. She said that when you are in the inner core of the Northern parcel, there aren't as many trees as one would think. She

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

said that being said, the petitioner's have established a very aggressive landscape plan that proposes three trees for every one tree removed. She said that the area would be reforested.

Greg Ewing discussed the densities of the other townhome projects in the area and reiterated the changes in the petition since the May 16, 2006 Plan Commission meeting. He discussed the specific groups of trees they were proposing to save. He noted that from Westfield blvd. the fronts of townhomes would be seen. He said that they would be providing two garage parking spaces, plus two parking spaces in the driveway, plus an additional 35 guest parking spaces. He said that the City has established a ninety-foot right of way for Westfield blvd. because they have classified it as urban arterial. He said that the request complies with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan proposal. He said that the site is within the Southern approach to the City Center. He said that the total assessed gross value for the properties right now is \$670,100.00. He said that when they are finished with the project, they estimate that they would probably have between \$25 and \$30 million in assessed valuation. He said that in talking with Steve Dillon at Carmel-Clay Schools, they established that they would be adding very few children to the school system. He noted that they were discussing a very large increase in the assessed valuation of the property while producing few children providing for a great deal of tax base for the City as well. He said that in terms of the entry and open space plan; they would provide brick pavers, granite-framed crosswalks in the entry area. He said that they planned to turn a significant Vectren Energy pipeline that cuts the site in half into a positive thing, by creating community green space, walking paths, etc. He said that they are proposing an 8 ft. walk along Westfield Blvd. He said that they are hoping to get clarification from the Parks Department on how they might be able to provide direct access to Central Park. He said that in terms of the drainage plan, they have an engineer on staff to address those issues and questions. He said that in terms of underground storage they are providing underground detention facilities. He said that it is environmentally-friendly and that they are providing porous pavements, which moves the development towards a LEED type of development. He said that underground storage is not uncommon. He said the petitioners had met with Scott Brewer, the environmental planner, and have continued to work closely with him to establish a landscape plan. He said that the plan proposed over three hundred trees on the site. He said that this would result in over 1400 caliper inches of trees. He said that the building elevations show the varied rooflines, individual building articulation, cornice detailing, varying front doors and designs of entry treatments. He said that there were staggered brick tones and bump outs.

Tim Stephens said that he wanted the public to keep an open mind. He said that they were going to be transforming the corridor. He said what they think they are looking for is to create a City of note. He said that looking forward twenty years, what would the area look like then? He said that the development will add traffic, but it is a type of home that is not available anywhere else in Carmel. He noted that Westfield has been labeled an urban arterial, so he said that it would have traffic. He said that they feel that it is the right vision for the future. He said that they were looking to make it a place that would not damage their property values. He said that they wanted to keep open dialogue.

Rick Ripma called for General Public Comments – Favorable.
Seeing none, he called for Organized Remonstrance – Unfavorable.

Fred Frauhiger, who resides at 1744 Creekside Lane, said that he was representing the Wood

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

Valley complex, Pine Valley complex, and a number of the residents along Rangeline Road and Westfield Blvd. He said that they are not opposed to the residential enhancement and development of Carmel. He said that he thinks that the current Mayor and his staff have done a tremendous job in terms of development. He said that one thing that they question as they look at the Comprehensive Plan is one section where it speaks about the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the Citywide objectives say to “protect single-family residential neighborhoods in Central Carmel as much as possible”. He said that the other statement that he thinks is equally important is the City-wide objectives and policies, where it states to “be very sensitive to connectivity and transitions between adjacent areas. Avoid harsh contrasts in height, building orientation, character, land use, and density. He said that he thinks their issue is, first and foremost, density. He quoted section 5.2 of the Central Carmel policies and objectives and section 6.4 of the Citywide objectives and policies of the Draft Carmel Comprehensive Plan update. He said that they would like to think and know that there is a lot of money and time that has been invested in the Draft Comprehensive Plan update. He said that they would like to feel that Carmel believes in the Draft Comprehensive Plan update, since it is the most current. He said that they feel that the proposed project of going from 110 units to 101 units is way over the top. He said that he remembers the May 16, 2006 Plan Commission meeting. He said that one gentleman on the Plan Commission said that it was over the top and that they needed to come back and he thinks the quote was “reduce it by at least half”. He said that obviously hasn’t occurred. He said that the other thing is when looking at the Draft Comprehensive Plan; Westfield blvd. is obviously a very important corridor. He said that it is probably the most beautiful corridor coming into downtown Carmel. He said that he would encourage the Committee to study the density of the surrounding neighborhoods on the aerial photos. He said that the density of the surrounding neighborhoods is not anywhere close to that. He said that the development would be a stark contrast. He said that he didn’t know where development would go from here. He said that they are not opposed to progress and development. He said that they think that one hundred units is way over the top and they would like the Committee to think the same. He said that he hopes that everybody can get on the same page and, if there is going to be development there, it can be a win-win situation where it will fit well and be a compliment to the expansion of the residential areas and tax base for Carmel.

Rick Ripma called for additional organized remonstrance – unfavorable.

Seeing none, he called for General Public Comments – unfavorable.

Grahame Curts, who lives at 11520 Westfield Blvd., said that his property is right adjacent to this proposed development. He said that the number one problem he has is drainage. He said that with the petitioner’s underground, he was wondering where the underground detention would drain to. He said that the other issue he has is that along the property line, he has eight large maples. He said that with the petitioner’s request to build twelve feet from the property line, he said that when the two story buildings go up, they will be in the canopy of the trees, because he said that the trees are eighty-five feet tall. He also said that wanted to know type of fence they would be putting along the property line.

Jack Engledow, who resides at 1819 Wood Valley Drive, said that he thinks that everyone’s idea of perfect zoning is to leave everything the way it was when they moved in. He said that

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

everyone knows that isn't going to quite work out. He said that they are delighted with the development that has taken place since they moved here in 1958. He said that what they do need to expect is that they have the protection of property rights and that there is a preservation of the kind of values and character that everyone moved out here to enjoy. He said that the way that you do that is through an organized plan. He said that Carmel has one and he thinks it is a good one. He noted the Comprehensive Plan call for the urban character to be reinforced North of 116th street, but he noted that this development would be South of 116th street, so there wouldn't be quite the emphasis on the urban environment. He said that promises to preserve trees often don't turn out well. He said that in twenty-five years which site would be the most attractive and different a ninety-foot wide expressway with three-story condominiums lining the way or a lot of nice maple trees along a shaded drive. He said that Indianapolis has been smart enough to maintain Meridian Street which is completely inadequate for traffic flow, but which is a wonderful, wonderful entrance to the City and a nice introduction to the City. He said that he thinks that Carmel has the opportunity to maintain a unique and different introduction to the City that doesn't look like every other City in the world. He said that he would suggest that this proposal needs considerable modification, as does the whole idea of the ninety-foot wide urban corridor from 106th to 116th streets.

Pete Stewart, who lives at 2030 Hamilton Lane, said that he is speaking on behalf of his Jordan Woods homeowners. He said that they agree with Mr. Engledow. He said that he appreciates the petitioner's willingness to make compromises. He said that there reaches a point where property owner's need to keep an open mind and realize that things cannot stay the same. He said that he thinks that developers and City servants need to realize that sometimes there has to be a point where you say, "this is enough". He said that they feel that any further development will substantially deteriorate the value of their homes. He said that their homes are their nest eggs. He said that their homes are of great value to them. He said that he thinks that it is important for Mann properties to realize that, perhaps, it would be best to develop a more rural and less congested area. He said that he fears that once the development is made, then the streets will need to be made larger and that will create more destruction of the trees and the beautiful street which already exists.

Neal Eggeson, who resides at 1727 Creekside Lane West, said that he is the Secretary for the Creekside Homeowner's Association. He said that he represents a total of nineteen buildings of the subdivision. He said that they are all unalterably opposed to this. He said that the plan was made decades ago and now we are going to treat it as if it is something that cannot be changed. He said that there is no connectivity when you go from single story buildings to three-stories. He said that just because the petitioner's have been proposing three-story buildings in other parts of Carmel, it doesn't make it right for this part of the City.

Judy Hagan, Clay Township trustee, said that this is a beautiful piece of property. She said that the ground itself has topography, has character, and has interest. She said that it deserves a better plan for development than has been presented to the Committee. She said that she would like the petitioners to think about the gateway to Carmel that this section of Westfield represents. She said that this is one of those areas that give this community a sense of place. She said that there is an opportunity to ensure that continues. She said that not everything has to be New

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

Urbanism. She said that it does not have to be townhouses up to the road. She said that the landmarks along 116th street have been bulldozed recently. She said that there is some progress that just has to be made because they have to be able to get around the community. She said that 116th street represents one of those areas where progress was imminent. She said that the site in question is not one of those properties. She asked the Committee to defeat this plan.

Mark Moorhead, who lives at 11451 Westfield Blvd., said that his one point playing off of Judy Hagan's comments is that Carmel is focusing on the Central Park and that the area has tremendous and gigantic opportunity to showcase the City. He said that entryway is going to be fabulous or not. He said that the view driving into Central Park would be viewed by people from all over. He said that having the opportunity to make that a real focus would be a great opportunity if the area were built up in a way that they would appreciate.

Julie Lease, of 1718 Pine Valley Drive, said that she was speaking on behalf of Elizabeth Grossman, who resides at 11201 Westfield Blvd. She read a letter from Elizabeth Grossman in opposition to the petition by reason of density and aesthetics. The letter is incorporated into the minutes by reference and the original is in the file.

Greg Robbins, who owns the property at 11400 Westfield Blvd., said that he and his wife have lived there for twenty years. He said that they actually bought the property from his wife's parents. He said that his wife had lived there for thirty-six years. He said that since they bought the house, they have put about \$450,000 into improving the house. He said then the park comes along. He said that this year they found out that the trees on the Northern and Western property lines will be completely taken out and there isn't anything they can do about it. He said that they used to have a completely private estate. He said that now they are open to everybody. He said that the property is no longer private to them at all. He said that over the last year, developers have been approaching them about purchasing the property. He said that they chose Mann Development because everything that they represented to them said that the project would be first class. He said that he understands that the townhomes were going to be expensive and that they would attract the kind of people who would want to use the park. He said that the park is going to be supported by user fees, so he said that there are going to have to be a lot of people using the health club and the restaurant and the other amenities. He said that he agrees that it is a drastic change. He said that it breaks their hearts that this has happened. He said that his wife is so upset about it that she couldn't be at the meeting. He said that for them, personally, they are receiving a large amount of money for the property and it sets their future. He said that they have three daughters. He said that it would pay for their college and it would give them a better life. He said that he would venture to guess that everyone in this room, if they were sitting in the house right now would love the house, but he said that the view is gone. He said that it is not the same anymore. He said that when the park opens, they would see hundreds of cars going in and out of the park. He said that it would never be the same place again. He said that after the pipeline goes through, they would just have a house in the middle of five acres with a few trees around.

Marilyn Mesh, who lives at 10918 Timber Lane, said that she has lived there for thirty-five years. She said that when she bought the lot, she never dreamed she would be so lucky to live in

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

such a beautiful area. She said that she looks at 116th street and she wants to cry. She said that she doesn't want to see the same thing happen to Westfield Blvd. She said it was like a gorgeous tunnel. She said that it provides a magnificent entry into Carmel. She said that she thinks that the proposed homes are totally out of character with the area. She said that she also doesn't see them as being very different from all of the other three-story townhomes. She said that she misses that fine line of difference between this project and what the City has everywhere else. She said that she wants to know what type of legacy the Plan Commission wants to be known for long term. She said that the people who are asking for the rezoning talk about the magnificent tax base that they are providing. She said that she sees her tax money going for things that are not helping her life but hurting it. She asked if Carmel was for sale. She said that we are not preserving what Carmel once was. She said that she saw in the paper that Mayor Brainard said that when he ran for election, people said that they wanted to see a downtown developed. She said that she didn't think that anybody in their wildest dreams had in mind what is currently going up. She said that the Draft Comprehensive plan talks about transitions. She said that she doesn't see the transitions. She said that she just had to say how very, very sad she finds this and she said that this was an opportunity for the Plan Commission to make a real difference.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that the City Forester still has issues with the landscape plan and the PUD language. She said that the Engineer's office still has issues as far as their Technical Advisory Committee Meeting comments. She said that the Department would like to see an update on the building elevations as far as seeing all four sides of the building rather than just the front. She said that the Staff recommends that this item be continued to the June 29, 2006 meeting.

Petitioner's Rebuttal: **Mary Solada** said that there was a letter in the information package, dated April 25, 2006 indicating the Carmel Engineering will work with the developer to ensure the success of the project, particularly as the petitioner approaches the underground drainage that has been discussed. She said that they have had very productive conversations with Engineering. She said that they are pretty close to having an agreement with regards to the Urban Forester and the landscape plan.

Tim Seitz said that a couple of the issues that he talked to the Urban Forester about were the trees regarding the entry along the Central park, additional shade trees along the Southern boundary, as well as constructed soils for the trees that are behind the units to provide a better soil base.

Mary Solada said that everyone got here because the City of Carmel made a public infrastructure investment together with the County Parks Department and Clay Township to build Central Park. There is no way that Mann Development would have pursued the property if it wasn't for the leadership and vision of the City itself. She said that when the project was originally filed, they were encouraged to increase the density. She said that the City started the ball rolling by removing the trees from Mr. Robbins property. She said that this development is 8.8 acres. She pointed out that Central Park is 164 acres. She said that will be a legacy of the Carmel leadership is leaving the community. She said that it all has to be in context how we got here.

Dan Dutcher said that there are three main entrances identified for Central Park. He said that there is an entrance off of Westfield Blvd., 111th Street, and there is an entrance off of College Avenue. He said that the Westfield Blvd. is probably not what he would identify as being the primary entrance. He asked the petitioner to see a tree preservation plan because he said that he wanted to see an inventory.

Tim Stephens said that a formal tree inventory had not been done, but that they would present one to the committee at the next meeting.

Dan Dutcher said that in looking at the proposed site plan, it still seems way to dense. He said that along the Northern boundary especially the buildings seemed very close together. He said that there is a need for green space and there is a need for a lot less density. He said that in the Pittman project there were some very attractive alternative two-story "courthomes". He said that if they are looking at some density to make the project economically viable, but that would also ease the transition between the surrounding area and this property, he said that he would urge the petitioners to take a look at that. He asked Angie Conn to clarify what the plans were for Westfield Blvd.

Angie Conn said that Westfield Blvd. was planned to have two lanes of traffic, one each way, with a planted median in the middle. She said that was where the ninety-foot of right of way would be going.

Dan Dutcher asked for clarification on how the underground detention areas work.

Brian Sullivan, with Mann Properties, said that the concept is that the water drains into the underground detention and the underground detention is typically a chamber of some sort that detains the water. He said that the water doesn't necessarily seep back into the ground but is detained in the chamber and then released at a controlled rate into wherever the drainage outlet is for the project. He said that it is typically done under a paved area. He clarified that they had done projects like that and used the underground detention before.

Dan Dutcher asked if the petitioner could provide more information with regards to traffic generation.

Tim Stephens said that he though that they could provide some more information on what you might expect as far as peak hour generation and adt type of stuff.

Kevin Heber said that he really wants to the gateway plan. He said that he thinks that is a good idea. He said that it kind of seems that this area should have an independent Carmel gateway overlay plan or corridor zone. He said that he wished that they had a plan that the Plan Commission could go off of. He said that the plan is not there and they don't have it but he likes the idea. He said that lacking that plan they have to take it on a case-by-case basis and look at other things. He said that it is a PUD and the Plan Commission is not compelled to approve it. He said that he would like to see the central greenway coupled to the park. He said that he was

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

thinking a modest pedestrian path that went down to the entryway for Central Park.

Mary Solada said that she wanted it to go on the record, that the petitioners are hoping for the same sort of connectivity, but that they haven't been given the permission to have that sort of connectivity yet.

Wayne Haney asked for clarification on the Department Report. He said that Rangeline is planned to have two lanes of travel with the central planted median. He asked if that meant two lanes of travel in each direction. He asked why they would want parallel parking along there.

Matt Griffin responded that the long-term vision is to have parallel parking space. He said that the functions of them would be different for different portions of Westfield. He said that they could function to slow speeds on that road. He said that Westfield Blvd. would feel more like a downtown urban street. He said that it was more appealing to have a buffer between yourself and the street.

Wayne Haney commented that he feels that the project is still too dense and he said that he didn't like the units and wall of units along Westfield Blvd. He said that they talk about the "gateway to Carmel" and the treeline almost the entire length. He said that he thinks that there are many ways to develop the site without having a wall along Westfield Blvd. He said that he liked Dan's comment about a two-story transition from the one-story residential area. He said that he looks at the aerial map and everything that he sees surrounding the site is residential. He said that this development would be a stark contrast. He said that he doesn't even see anywhere in the Comprehensive plan where multi-family will be extended anywhere near the site. He said that he thinks that there needs to be a softer transition between single-family residential and multi-family.

Carol Schleif asked the petitioner if they had looked at any Universal Design for the units. She asked the petitioners to look at Universal Design. She said that she likes the concept of Universal Design. She said that she would appreciate anything that the petitioners could do in that regard. She said that Leo Dierckman had asked at the previous meeting for the site plan to be redone. She said that it looks to her like they removed a couple of units and rotated one building. She said that trees are an issue. She said that there is a mention in the PUD ordinance about platting into smaller parcels. She said that she would like some clarification on that.

Tim Stephens said that there is typically a yard that goes along with the townhomes. He said that there would be a lot that would be subdivided from this. He said that there would be a deeded parcel that would go along with the unit and that not all of the area surrounding the condo building would be common area, but that there would be a yard that would be owned along with the condo.

Carol Schleif said that the roof design needs a little more attention. She said that these really just still look like townhomes. She said that there is a little bit of undulation and that shows effort to make it a little different, but that what she is really seeing is townhomes. She said that there is a lot of building. She said that she has seen some townhomes that have eaves and

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

dormers at the second story and are actually three stories. She said that technique really helps with the transition. She said that might be an idea for these roofs. She said that the hip roofs, specifically on the end units, would help bring it to human scale. She said that she thinks that buildings with seven consecutive units is really intense. She said that she thinks that the elevations should vary between the buildings. She said that there is a mention of cement fiber siding that needs to be changed to be generic and include no brand name. She said that because of the liability issues with installation it should be include verbiage that certified installers would install it. She said that her dream on deciduous trees is to do four and a half inch caliper. She said that with buildings this large and with the large trees being removed, this might be a good case for replacing mitigating with larger trees. She said that evergreens are transplantable. She said that she would request full foundation plantings. She said that she would have a shade tree on every unit. She said that she would find ways to have intentional views for every unit. She said that there is a lot of roof and pavement going in on the site. She said hat a twenty-foot building separation for buildings that tall is miniscule. She noted that a lot of the units had front-loading garages. She said that basically she thinks that the petitioners just have too much on the site.

Rick Ripma said that Docket No. 06040017 PUD: Townhomes at Central Park would be continued to the June 29, 2006 meeting. He said that he would leave the public hearing open.

...END...

8. Docket No. 06030025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Pearson Ford

The applicant seeks Development Plan, Architectural Design, Lighting, and Signage Amendment approval for 30 acres, for the purpose building an addition to an existing building, for vehicle collision repair.

The site is located at 10650 North Michigan Road and is zoned B3/Business. The site is located partially within the US 421/Michigan Road Overlay District.

Filed by John Pearson of Pearson Realty, LLC, for Pearson Ford.

Present for the Petitioner: Dave Coots, office address of 255 E.Carmel Drive, represents Pearson Ford in this request. John Pearson, Mike Balay, and Mike Hoff were also present.

Petitioner's Presentation: Dave Coots said that he would be running through the development plan, which is on tab 5 of the Plan Commission booklet. He said that there were a couple of modifications to the plans that would not be reflected in the booklet. He said that those items pertained to the drainage issue that is in the Boone County jurisdiction. He said that the plans for the drainage had been submitted to the Town of Zionsville and that their consultant, HNTB was in the process of reviewing them, but that they had no written approval yet. He said that they were scheduled to be on the Zionsville Plan Commission agenda for June 19, 2006 for their final approval. He said that Terry Jones, executive director of the Zionsville Planning Department, said that assuming the plans and drawings incorporate the suggestions they have made, and then they will be approved. He said that Hamilton County tells them that the drainage plans and calculations, assuming Zionsville approves it, are acceptable to Hamilton County. He said that Hamilton County would issue their letter once Zionsville issues their approval. He said

June 6, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes

that they are kind of backed up in terms of the approval process on the drainage. He said that the right of way dedication on 106th Street has been according to Hamilton County, Boone County, and Carmel's Plan, 60 ft. in Carmel/Hamilton County's portion of it and 55 feet in the Zionville/Boone County portion of it. He said that the Nottingham Road, which runs 106th Street North and then bends East to 421 will be built according to City standards. He said that the continuation of the stub street to the north is an item of the development plan that the petitioner's feel is critical in terms of location because it designates where that road will go on the petitioner's plan, but it will also dictate where the property goes on to the other property. He said that the 60 ft. by 182 ft. addition to the truck service center's building exterior has all been converted to the concrete panels. He said that the Department had requested skylights be placed in the building, but he said that there was a preference to use artificial lighting inside the structure because of the dust and smoke. He discussed the exterior changes proposed to the quick lane or quick lube business. He said that the major ADLS application being submitted is the new structure, which will be the performance collision center. He said that structure would be a 30, 185 square ft., two-story, all-brick building. He said that the building would be the new Collision Center. He said that the West elevation has been changed to incorporate six windows. He said that the architectural design conforms to the overlay zone. He discussed the specific architectural features of the new structure. He said that the landscaping has been submitted to the Urban Forester. He said that the West side of the property would be landscaped to the 421 overlay standards. He discussed the new proposed lighting products. He said that the Department has pointed out that they will need to meet and go through the signage sizes with the petitioner to verify the sizes. He said that there are two signs that will require a variance—sign number six and sign number seven. He said that the signs would be internally illuminated. He presented a sample of the sign lettering and materials.

Seeing there were no members of the public present to speak, **Rick Ripma** moved on to the Department Report.

Department Report: **Angie Conn** said that there is a difference of opinion on how the sign ordinance is interpreted. She said that the development plan is considered one complex. She said that by considering it a complex, the signage types and locations allowed are a little different. She said that the Department recommends that the Committee approve the item voting on everything except the signage. She said that the signage would just be kept in Committee until the Petitioner and Department have worked through the issues.

Carol Schleif asked about the storm drainage calculations.

Mike Hoff said that they were for the new Hamilton County standards. He said that they have to retain more to release at a slower rate.

Carol Schleif asked about the possibility of skylights. She provided the petitioner with some information and research on skylights. She said that she has some questions about the signs. She asked if the petitioner's currently had too many signs.

Angie Conn responded that the petitioners had previously received a variance to allow the seven

June 6, 2006
Carmel Plan Commission Subdivision Committee Minutes
signs that they currently have.

Wayne Haney said that he didn't like the green signs with the red brick.

Rick Ripma said that in the back of the packet there is a different quick lane set up than what was shown.

Dave Coots said that the petitioners had removed that and the very last page because the alignment was too much.

Dan Dutcher made formal motion to **approve Docket No. 06030025 DP Amend/ADLS Amend: Pearson Ford severing out of the motion the signage portion of the request.**

The motion was seconded.

Motion was **approved 5-0.**

...END...

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

Subdivision Committee Chair – Rick Ripma

Respectfully Submitted By: Laura Rouse-DeVore